



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,753	06/27/2003	Robert B. Magill	2376.2431-001	5555
57690 7590 03/24/2010 HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133				
EXAMINER O'CONNOR, BRIAN T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2475				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/24/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/606,753

Applicant(s)

MAGILL ET AL.

Examiner

Brian O'Connor

Art Unit

2475

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-19.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/DANG T TON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2475

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant argues (see page 6, last partial paragraph) with respect to claims 1 and 6 that "This model, however, does not store packets in Hoof's PBU based on which ECU wants them."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 6 as anticipated by Hoof because Hoof discloses a switch fabric (PBU) storing cells (packets) based on an output queue (ECU). The switch fabric (PBU) stores the packet for a certain period of time based on when the output queue (ECU) sends a booking message to release the packet from the switch fabric's memory (column 3, lines 63-67).

Applicant argues (see page 7, first full paragraph) with respect to claims 1 and 6 that "Thus, Hoof's PBU does not store packets based on any information from the ECU, because not until Hoof has already stored the packets in the PBU are the ECU(s) notified that the packet even exists and because changing storage would potentially adversely affect subscription server for some ECUs."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 6 as anticipated by Hoof because Hoof discloses a switch fabric (PBU) storing cells (packets) based on an output queue (ECU). The switch fabric (PBU) stores the packet for a certain period of time based on when the output queue (ECU) sends a booking message to release the packet from the switch fabric's memory (column 3, lines 63-67).

Applicant argues (see page 7, last full paragraph) with respect to claims 1 and 6 that "the PBU stores the packet before any ECU has requested a subscription. Thus, no storing is based on a booking message, only transmission from storage is based on a booking message."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 6 as anticipated by Hoof because Hoof discloses a switch fabric (PBU) storing cells (packets) based on an output queue (ECU). The switch fabric (PBU) stores the packet for a certain period of time based on when the output queue (ECU) sends a booking message to release the packet from the switch fabric's memory (column 3, lines 63-67). Thus the packet is stored for a length of time based on the output queue.

Applicant argues (see page 8, fifth full paragraph) with respect to claims 8 and 17 that "The Office's proposed combination would cause Hoof's ECUs to receive packets directly forwarded from the inputs, resulting in burst-overload."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 8 and 17 over Hoof in view of Chao because the modification the the controller in the ECU of Hoof would be adding a priority list and level as taught Chao. Causing the Hoof's ECU controller to hold and use priority levels would produce a successful and predicted operational apparatus to switch packets.

Applicant argues (see page 8, last partial paragraph) with respect to claims 8 and 17 that "In addition, for such a combination even to exist, Hoof would have to be substantially modified completely to remove the PBU because Chao requires direction transmission of packets from an input port to an output buffer without any intermediate storage, as opposed to Hoof's intermediate storage in PBUs."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 8 and 17 over Hoof in view of Chao because the modification the the controller in the ECU of Hoof would be adding a priority list and level as taught Chao. Causing the Hoof's ECU controller to hold and use priority levels would produce a successful and predicted operational apparatus to switch packets.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues (see page 6, last partial paragraph) with respect to claims 1 and 6 that "This model, however, does not store packets in Hoof's PBU based on which ECU wants them."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 6 as anticipated by Hoof because Hoof discloses a switch fabric (PBU) storing cells (packets) based on an output queue (ECU). The switch fabric (PBU) stores the packet for a certain period of time based on when the output queue (ECU) sends a booking message to release the packet from the switch fabric's memory (column 3, lines 63-67).

Applicant argues (see page 7, first full paragraph) with respect to claims 1 and 6 that "Thus, Hoof's PBU does not store packets based on any information from the ECU, because not until Hoof has already stored the packets in the PBU are the ECU(s) notified that the packet even exists and because changing storage would potentially adversely affect subscription server for some ECUs."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 6 as anticipated by Hoof because Hoof discloses a switch fabric (PBU) storing cells (packets) based on an output queue (ECU). The switch fabric (PBU) stores the packet for a certain period of time based on when the output queue (ECU) sends a booking message to release the packet from the switch fabric's memory (column 3, lines 63-67).

Applicant argues (see page 7, last full paragraph) with respect to claims 1 and 6 that "the PBU stores the packet before any ECU has requested a subscription. Thus, no storing is based on a booking message, only transmission from storage is based on a booking message."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 6 as anticipated by Hoof because Hoof discloses a switch fabric (PBU) storing cells (packets) based on an output queue (ECU). The switch fabric (PBU) stores the packet for a certain period of time based on when the output queue (ECU) sends a booking message to release the packet from the switch fabric's memory (column 3, lines 63-67). Thus the packet is stored for a length of time based on the output queue.

Applicant argues (see page 8, fifth full paragraph) with respect to claims 8 and 17 that "The Office's proposed combination would cause Hoof's ECUs to receive packets directly forwarded from the inputs, resulting in burst-overload."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 8 and 17 over Hoof in view of Chao because the modification the the controller in the ECU of Hoof would be adding a priority list and level as taught Chao. Causing the Hoof's ECU controller to hold and use priority levels would produce a successful and predicted operational apparatus to switch packets.

Applicant argues (see page 8, last partial paragraph) with respect to claims 8 and 17 that "In addition, for such a combination even to exist, Hoof would have to be substantially modified completely to remove the PBU because Chao requires direction transmission of packets from an input port to an output buffer without any intermediate storage, as opposed to Hoof's intermediate storage in PBUs."

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 8 and 17 over Hoof in view of Chao because the modification the the controller in the ECU of Hoof would be adding a priority list and level as taught Chao. Causing the Hoof's ECU controller to hold and use priority levels would produce a successful and predicted operational apparatus to switch packets.